

They show their evaluation of her through their own rites and meetings" (p. 32).

This differs from Schur's notion of the source of the structural ambivalence present within society. While Schur implies that the devaluation of women propagates from and is supported by the behavior and perception of men, the literature cited indicates that female gang members are influenced more by the constraints of their female peers than by the perceptions of male gang members. Contrary to the literature, one could argue that because female gangs are most often auxiliary components to male gangs, female gang members are more dependant upon their male counterparts to define gender-related norms than are females in the society at large, where independent female associations are more likely to occur. Nevertheless, what seems necessary is to approach female gang delinquency and the normative structure of the gang as it relates to both male and female peer influences, recognizing that both are important determinants of delinquent behavior. This paper has been an attempt to begin such a process.

REFERENCES

- Bowker, Lee H. and Malcom W. Klein. 1983. "The Etiology of Female Juvenile Delinquency and Gang Membership: A Test of Psychological and Social Structural Explanations." *Adolescence* 18:738-51
- Campbell, Anne. 1987. "Self Definition by Rejection: The Case of Gang Girls." *Social Problems* 34:451-65
- _____. 1984. *The Girls in the Gang*. New York, NY: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Giordano, Peggy C. 1978. "Girls, Guys and Gangs: The Changing Social Context of Female Delinquency." *The Journal of Criminal Law Criminology* 69:126-32.
- Horowitz, Ruth. 1986. *Honor and the American Dream: Culture and Identity in a Chicano Community*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rice, R. 1963. "A Reporter at Large: The Persian Queens." *New Yorker* October 19, 39:153.
- Schur, Edwin M. 1984. *Labeling Women Deviant: Gender, Stigma, and Social Control*. New York, NY: Random House Inc.
- Smart, Carol. 1976. *Women, Crime, and Criminology: A Feminist Critique*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Smith, Lesley S. 1978. "Sexist Assumptions and Female Delinquency: An Empirical Investigation." In *Women, Sexuality and Social Control*, edited by Carol Smart and Bary Smart. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

GENDER AND EVALUATION IN FINE ART*

Tracy X. Karner
The University of Kansas

Mid-American Review of Sociology, 1991, Vol. XV, No. 1:53-69

The significance of gender and its potential as a stigmatic social label in the field of art is investigated. As art objectifies both a society's ideals and biases, the recognition and appreciation of art can be seen as a pivotal point from which to study social values. Gender, having been previously identified as a stigmatic label in formalized careers, is hypothesized to account for the lack of recognized art works by women. Especially as the realm of art has no formalized criteria for evaluating competence. The supposed existence of an aesthetic difference between the art works of men and women is also explored.

INTRODUCTION

"At last, a woman on paper!"

"Why they're genuinely fine things--you say a woman did these--She's an unusual woman--She's broad minded, she's bigger than--most women, but she's got the sensitive emotion--I'd known she was a woman, O look at that line...." (Alfred Stieglitz is rumored to have exclaimed upon discovering the work of Georgia O'Keeffe in Castro 1985, p. 31).

All social estimations of good versus poor are by definition subjective; artistic demarcation is no exception. Such evaluation is, however, a very broad and complex process. This project focuses exclusively on the perception and presumption of sex and gender differences in the field of fine art. Whether an artist's gender influences the production of her/his artwork or merely the reception of it, has long been debated. Are decisions of recognition based on an artist's talent (or lack of talent) or on an "expert's" subjective view of something other than the work--the sex of the artist? The orientation of this research is gender and its potential as a stigmatic social label for women in the field of art.

*I wish to acknowledge the assistance of James Aho, Paul Zelus, and Miles Friend for their comments and support.

This project was in part funded by an Idaho State University Graduate Student Research Grant, Fall 1987.

GENDER AESTHETICS AND STIGMAS

Women writers have regularly disguised their gender when attempting to have their works recognized by literary experts as well as the general public. George Eliot, George Sand, and the Bronte sisters all took male pen-names in an effort to escape the stigma of gender. McCane-O'Connor (1979), an artist found it a "dreadful thing to have one's paintings identifiable as having been done by a woman." Pastel colors, painting flowers or children, using applique or embroidery were considered "stylistic anathema" to be avoided at all costs. All signs of the female experience, McCane-O'Connor continues, had to be divested from a work to be considered professional and not trivial.

However, both male and female artists tend to define the act of creating similarly. This perception "suggests that sex role differentiation is of little importance in this process" of artistic creativity (Birg and Peterson 1985). Yet art experts have long held the belief of a feminine aesthetic separate from the mainstream aesthetic. For example, Nemser (1972) asserts that "because women have children it is believed that only they can paint them." Erik Erikson attempted to test this hypothesis in his studies of children. He found that spatial constructs apparently vary by sex. According to Erikson (quoted in Polson 1979), the form of "one's genitals contributes to the organization of spatial arrangements that possess distinctive male or female characteristics." Women, he claims, emphasize the anatomical inner space, focusing on filling spaces, and concentrating on the interiors. Males, according to Erikson, are more concerned with the exterior size of their work (Polson 1979). Others disagree.

Nemser (1972), contends that even if an individual's sexual apparatus could be shown to influence their brain's functioning (of which she reminds us we have no proof), it would "be completely unrealistic to expect to be able to locate its effect in their art." While many experts, Nemser admits, continue to profess the ability to make sexual differentiation of artists strictly on the basis of visual perusals of their work, they are, she insists "projecting their antecedent knowledge of the artist's sex on to the artwork rather than obtaining it from their own immediate visual experience" (1972). Barron's study of the San Francisco Art Institute did not identify gender bias as a problem. In fact he found that when the students' works were evaluated by experts, the women's art was judged as highly as that of the men. "There were no discrepancies in ability or quality of work based on sex differences" (Barron 1972). Concurring, Weisstein (1970) discusses a study that asked graduate students to correctly identify which of two piles of clinical TAT tests were written by men and which by women. Only 4 of 20 students were able to correctly identify the sex of the writer. All 20 students had just spent a month and a half studying the psychological differences between the sexes (Weisstein 1970). Thus, evaluation procedures analyzed by Nemser (1972),

Barron (1972), and Weisstein (1970) do not provide any evidence for a separate, distinct "feminine aesthetic."

The findings on this question are by no means unequivocal. For example, Boyette and Reeves (1982; 1983), claim to have empirically identified gender differences in the content and form of children's art. In subjects ranging in age from 9 to 12 years old, the boys were more likely to draw violent or active scenes than the girls. Girls drew more domestic scenes and used round shapes whereas boys drew more angular forms. (The Boyette and Reeves research will be heavily utilized in the formulation of the current project.)

Related research has also been done on the effect of gender as a perceived status (Hughes 1945); on the perception of abilities of police officers in New Zealand (which finds that women rated female officers faster, stronger, and more effective than male respondents [Singer and Singer 1984]); on an Attitudes Toward Women Scale, (wherein women are found to display much less gender bias toward other women than are men [Rossi and Rossi 1985]); and on attitudes toward sexism using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (which concludes that men score much higher in the area of sexism than do women [Faulkender 1985]).

Sociologists have previously concluded that women have been treated as "marginal participants" within male dominated careers, such as law (Epstein 1970; White 1971; Hagan 1990), medicine (Lopate 1968), science and engineering (Mattfield and Van Aken 1965; Cole and Cole 1973), and academics (Bernard 1964; Simon, Clark, and Galway 1967; Rush 1987), and that ratings of occupational prestige and occupational desirability decreases significantly if the proportion of women in the occupation in question appear to be increasing (Touhey 1974).

All of the above cited studies concern career fields with formal status structures, or they concern attitudes and behaviors of individuals in analogously structured employment situations. Little research has been done on informal career fields such as fine art. This is significant as the informality of artistic status recognition may occasion more gender bias than already confirmed in the more rigid occupational structures. Furthermore, negotiation of the gender labels may be particularly problematic for women insofar as the vast majority of gatekeepers in the artworld are men.

There is evidence that women artists are not viewed equally to men within the artworld. Women may be rewarded for "ladylike achievement" in the arts (Nochlin 1971) or for their "artistic hobby," but not necessarily for serious artistic intent. Female artists are often considered less dedicated than their male counterparts, especially if they rely on a husband's or father's financial support (McCall 1978). Only six women have ever been admitted to the American Academy of Arts and Letters, a national society to honor outstanding artists, writers and musicians (Streifer-Rubinstein 1982, p. 518). In some cases, esteemed art works have been misattributed to male contemporaries,

instead of being recognized as the creation of a woman (Hess 1971; McCane-O'Connor 1979; Zimmerman 1981).

Women also tend to out number men as students of art. Male children are traditionally discouraged from entering the field of art and encouraged to choose a career with more certain rewards since they supposedly will have the financial responsibility for their future family (Griff 1970). For women, however, a knowledge of art may be seen as an investment by upper socioeconomic class parents in creating a more marketable (marriageable) commodity. At the same time, "a female, while encouraged as an art student or as a housewife art amateur, may be severely discouraged if she persists beyond those levels" (Whitesel 1975). Thus, as more women study art, a disproportionate number of men are recognized as artists both with status and financial rewards. Women's art sells more slowly and for lower prices than works by men (Gillespie 1979).

Belief in a gender difference in artistic creation has been used to justify women's lack of recognition in the field. This project will attempt to test the existence of a distinct "feminine aesthetic." The influence of an artists gender on an evaluation of the work will also be investigated. Thus, this research will focus on the effects of gender within processes of artistic demarcation.

METHODOLOGY

This study is concerned with the subjective evaluation of artworks and more specifically with whether men and women respond to art differently and whether the perceived sex of the artist influences such judgments. Paintings were chosen for this analysis because this medium is more accessible to a general audience. Furthermore, these paintings needed to have been recognized by critics as noteworthy contributions to the realm of fine art. Thus, *American Women Artists* by Charlotte Streifer-Rubinstein (1982), a book on acclaimed American women artists, was used as the sampling frame. Limiting the analysis to paintings executed from 1900 to the present, twelve works of art were randomly selected from this book. Photographic slides were then made of the chosen paintings to facilitate viewing by large groups. These slides were in turn randomly assigned to two gender groupings of six paintings each.

The slides were displayed for evaluation by students in Arts and Sciences general education classes at Idaho State University during spring semester, 1988. These classes were selected on the basis of instructor cooperation and consisted of a disproportionate amount of "Introduction to Sociology" and "Social Problems" classes. In spite of this, a reasonable cross-section of university students was obtained. Out of a total of 112 respondents, 46% were men and 54% women. Breaking the respondents into class standing, 43% were freshmen, 30% sophomores and 27% juniors and seniors. Almost half (47%) were aged 18 to 21 years old, 18% were aged 22 to 25 and the remaining 35%

were 26 or older. In declaring their majors, 18% specified Business, 27% listed Education, 9% named Health Related fields, and 27% were in the College of Arts and Sciences. Of the latter, 5% were majoring in the hard sciences, 21% in the soft sciences and 1% in the humanities. An additional 1% were unspecified as to their majors and 21% were undecided.

Each student was asked to view the slides and complete an "Art Evaluation Survey." This instrument consists of two parts: respondent background information and a separate evaluation of each of the twelve paintings. The respondents were told that the purpose of the study was to compare the judgments of the paintings by the general public to those of art experts. The slides were administered in two patterns, each to approximately half the respondents. Pattern A listed the six paintings in group one as executed by women artists and the six in group two as painted by men. Pattern B reversed the test condition. This facilitated each painting being evaluated under the presumption of each gender. Additionally, it eliminated the possibility of a negative evaluation of a poorly received painting being misconstrued as gender bias. The six paintings from group one were interspersed with those from group two, so as to guard against possible set response patterns. Paintings were listed by the proper title, by the date of their execution and for the most part by the true name of the artist. Fictitious male first names were substituted when the painting was listed as a male painter's endeavor, i.e., Janet Fish became Stanley Fish. These identifiers were listed on the survey form as well as announced verbally for each slide while it was displayed to the respondents.

The art evaluation survey was modeled primarily after the Boyette and Reeves study (1982;1983) and less so after the suggestions found in the writings of various art critics, such as McCane-O'Connor (1979), Nemser (1972) and Polson (1979). It consists of nine semantic differential pairs, scaled into a Gender Identifier Index (GII) to be applied to each of the twelve paintings. The semantic differential pairs include active/passive, brilliant/reserved, linear/curved, hard/soft, strong/light, ferocious/domestic, intense/pale, angular/round, violent/peaceful. Active, brilliant, linear, hard, strong, ferocious, intense, angular, and violent are considered in this research to be "masculine" identifiers. They are coded with a score of one. Their opposites are coded as "feminine" and given a score of two. Thus, each painting can receive a Gender Identifier Index (GII) score ranging from 9 (masculine) to 18 (feminine). The survey also includes a good/poor art evaluation choice and a question to determine the respondent's prior familiarity with each painting. The use of this measurement device allows for the collection of data at the ordinal level and will permit the use of non-parametric statistical tests in its analysis. Two general research propositions, derived from the literature are tested:

- #1a Paintings attributed to female artists will receive higher Gender Identifier Index (GII) scores.
- #1b Paintings attributed to male artists will receive lower Gender Identifier Index (GII) scores.
- #2 Paintings with higher, that is more feminine, Gender Identifier Index (GII) scores will be labeled poor art more often than paintings with lower GII scores.

Two auxiliary propositions are also posed, based on Faulkender (1985) and Rossi and Rossi (1985) research which suggests that men display a higher tendency toward sexism:

- #3 Male respondents will select more feminine identifiers than will female respondents.
- #4 A painting's Gender Identifier Index (GII) score will vary with the perceived gender of the artist (PGA) more when scored by the male respondents than by women.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The coded survey results were analyzed with the SPSSX Breakdown procedure to obtain a mean Gender Identifier Index (GII) score for each painting under all conditions (Tables 1,2,3). A frequency procedure was also run for all variables.

Proposition #1a Paintings attributed to female artists will receive higher Gender Identifier Index scores.

Proposition #1b Paintings attributed to male artists will receive lower Gender Identifier Index scores.

Overall there was no support for the first proposition. The GII scores did not vary significantly, as hypothesized, between perceived gender of the artist (PGA) conditions. None of the twelve paintings received substantially higher GII scores, (that is, more "feminine" scores) when attributed to a female artist (proposition #1a), nor were they scored meaningfully lower or more "masculine" when attributed to a male artist (proposition #1b). Both male and female respondent groups each scored seven paintings (though not the exact same seven) higher (more feminine) under the PGA-Female condition, although not significantly so. The mean gender identifier index (GII) score for all paintings under all conditions is 13.57, only slightly higher than the median point on the index of 13.50. (Recall, the GII scores can vary between 9 and 18.) Thus it can be said that the respondents did not appear to label more feminine identifiers when a painting was attributed to a female artist, nor was the reverse true. The gender of the artist did not seem to influence the attitudes of the survey respondents.

Table 1. Painting Mean Scores Under Differing Conditions

		PGA-Female	PGA-Male	Sample Mean
P A I N T I N G S	#1	15.78	15.44	15.59
	#2	14.75	14.56	14.66
	#3	14.44	15.00	14.75
	#4	15.22	14.89	15.04
	#5	13.94	14.67	14.26
	#6	10.36	10.22	10.30
	#7	10.51	10.68	10.61
	#8	10.71	11.25	10.95
	#9	14.90	15.26	15.10
	#10	14.70	15.27	14.95
	#11	12.96	12.87	12.91
	#12	13.74	12.58	13.24
<hr/>				
Condition Means		13.50	13.56	13.57
<hr/>				
PGA = perceived gender of the artist				

Gender has been previously identified as a stigmatic label in more formalized careers such as medicine and law. Thus, its potential as a stigma has been used to account for the general lack of recognized artworks by women. This might be especially true insofar as the realm of art has no formalized criteria for evaluating competence and judgments must be made on a subjective basis. Yet support was not found for the first research proposition concerning gender discrimination in art. This leads to speculation as to the validity of such claims of bias as well as discussions of separate gender aesthetics.

One potential research problem may be the theoretical basis of the proposition of gender bias itself. It may be true that as far as these twelve paintings are concerned, their evaluation was not affected by the perceived gender of the artist. However, the GII mean scores do vary considerably, as each painting's index score has a standard deviation of 1.5 to 2.0. Yet, this evidently cannot be construed as distinct gender bias. If an artwork is being judged on something other than the piece itself, it does not appear to be the artist's gender. This seems to substantiate, although not conclusively, Barron's (1972) findings of no such bias in the evaluation of art.

Table 2. Painting Mean Scores of Male Respondents

		<u>PGA-Male</u>	<u>PGA-Female</u>	<u>Both Conditions</u>
P A I N T I N G S	#1	15.52	15.54	15.53
	#2	14.93	14.33	14.67
	#3	14.60	15.04	14.85
	#4	16.00	15.21	15.55
	#5	13.86	14.76	14.24
	#6	10.67	10.20	10.47
	#7	10.33	10.90	10.67
	#8	10.79	10.95	10.86
	#9	15.00	16.03	15.60
	#10	14.63	15.10	14.63
	#11	13.29	12.76	12.98
	#12	14.38	13.57	14.04
Condition Means		13.67	13.70	13.68
PGA = perceived gender of the artist				

Table 3. Painting Mean Scores of Female Respondents

		<u>PGA-Male</u>	<u>PGA-Female</u>	<u>Both Conditions</u>
P A I N T I N G S	#1	16.00	15.35	15.64
	#2	14.58	14.75	14.65
	#3	14.32	14.97	14.67
	#4	14.64	14.61	14.62
	#5	14.00	14.60	14.28
	#6	10.09	10.24	10.16
	#7	10.64	10.47	10.55
	#8	10.64	11.48	11.02
	#9	14.82	14.58	14.69
	#10	15.06	15.39	15.21
	#11	12.70	12.97	12.58
	#12	13.18	11.81	12.57
Condition Means		13.39	13.44	13.47
PGA = perceived gender of the artist				

The gender identifier index (GII) provided for a painting to be scored from 9.0 (masculine) to 18.0 (feminine), yet the overall mean GII score for the entire sample was 13.57, nearly at the scale median, neither "feminine" nor "masculine". This calls into question the existence of a male versus female aesthetic as identified by Boyette and Reeves (1982;1983) who claim to have found such differences in the artwork of children. As all the paintings were executed by women, had such a female aesthetic existed, the general mean score should have been much higher, skewed to the "feminine" side of the index. The findings of this study seem to concur with the conclusions of Harris, Smith and Perricone (1988) that in their creative work artists are androgynous instead of being stereotypically "male" or "female." This also agrees with Birg and Peterson (1985).

Proposition #2 Paintings with higher Gender Identifier Index scores will be labeled poor art more often than paintings with lower GII scores.

In support of this second proposition, the mean gender identifier index (GII) scores for all paintings, except *Soho Women Artists* (#1), were higher when rated as poor art (Table 4). That is, except for #1, paintings rated as "feminine" were more often considered poor art. While none of these scores varied considerably, three of the paintings (#4, #9 and #11) had GII mean scores that were higher by more than 1.00, when evaluated as poor art. Thus the pattern is consistent with the research proposition. Perhaps this is only reflective of this particular audience's alleged lack of appreciation for what they perceive to be feminine. This leads to a speculation that the more "femininity" is perceived in art objects, the more likely their desirability and prestige will decrease. Such a notion is consistent with the observations of Touhey (1974) concerning employment situations.

Table 4. Painting Mean Scores When Rated Good or Poor Art

		<u>Good</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Sample</u>
P A I N T I N G S	#1	15.61	15.50	15.57
	#2	14.56	14.72	14.64
	#3	14.51	15.42	14.79
	#4	14.80	15.84	15.04
	#5	14.17	14.82	14.24
	#6	10.21	10.45	10.30
	#7	10.63	10.60	10.61
	#8	10.81	11.32	10.95
	#9	14.84	15.86	15.10
	#10	14.80	15.04	14.96
	#11	12.48	13.48	12.90
	#12	13.17	13.28	13.22

Proposition #3 Male respondents will select more feminine identifiers than will female respondents.

The mean summary gender identifier index (GII) scores of all the male respondents were higher under both conditions than were the female respondents summary means (Table 5) lending some confirmation to the third research proposition. Although not significant, it does suggest that men may label more aspects as "feminine," than did the women. As such, these findings are consistent with the studies of Singer and Singer (1984), Rossi and Rossi (1985), and Faulkender (1985), all of which find a difference between male and female evaluative attitudes. In this study, men did tend to be more sensitive to judgments of femininity.

Table 5. Summary of Condition Mean Scores

	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
<u>PGA-Male</u>	13.67	13.39
<u>PGA-Female</u>	13.70	13.44

PGA = perceived gender of the artist

Proposition #4 A painting's Gender Identifier Index score will vary with the perceived gender of the artist more when scored by the male respondents than by the women.

This notion was posed to see if men attend more to the stereotyped gender differences than do women. In analyzing the absolute difference between GII scores under both PGA conditions for each respondent group (Table 6), the overall variance is greater for male respondents (mean difference of .57) than for female respondents (mean difference of .49). Male respondents have a larger absolute difference for nine of the twelve paintings (all except #1, #3, #12). That is, a male's score of a painting attributed to a female artist, will vary more when compared to another man's score of the same painting attributed to a male painter, than will the scores of the female respondents under the different gender conditions. Therefore the fourth proposition is mildly supported.

To summarize, none of the four research propositions can be advanced. Yet the last three (2,3, and 4) have received enough support to warrant further study. It is possible that the small size of the sample retarded the opportunity for significant variance and that with a substantially larger sample these three propositions may be confirmed. (Of course, this is true for any test of significance).

Table 6. Absolute Differences between Respondent Groups GII Mean Scores Under Both PGA Effects

	<u>Male Respondents</u>	<u>Female Respondents</u>
Paintings	#1 .02	.65
	#2 .60	.17
	#3 .44	.65
	#4 .79	.03
	#5 .90	.60
	#6 .57	.15
	#7 .57	.17
	#8 .16	.84
	#9 1.03	.24
	#10 .47	.33
	#11 .53	.27
	#12 .81	1.37

Table 7. Percentage of Respondents Identifying Paintings As Good Art, Poor Art and Familiar

	<u>Good Art</u>	<u>Poor Art</u>	<u>Familiar With Art</u>
Paintings	#1 65%	35%	2%
	#2 54%	46%	5%
	#3 69%	31%	9%
	#4 77%	22%	6%
	#5 90%	10%	4%
	#6 65%	36%	5%
	#7 38%	62%	6%
	#8 75%	25%	4%
	#9 75%	25%	5%
	#10 32%	68%	2%
	#11 58%	42%	2%
	#12 55%	45%	5%

Painting Specific Patterns

Further investigation of the data reveals interesting painting specific patterns. By computing the absolute difference between GII mean scores under the various effects for each painting, high degrees of variance are found for certain paintings. In an attempt to understand these occurrences, additional independent variables are hypothesized at this point--that of a painting's style and it's subject matter. As all the paintings used in this project were selected randomly, these effects were not considered or expected. Below, the content and painting style of the specific paintings with the greatest GII mean score variances are discussed for both of the possible research effects, i.e., the respondents sex and the perceived gender of the artist (PGA) condition.

Table 8. The Effect of the Respondents Sex on the GII Mean Scores

	Absolute Difference
#1	.11
#2	.02
#3	.18
#4	.07
#5	.04
Paintings #6	.31
#7	.07
#8	.16
#9	.91
#10	.58
#11	.13
#12	1.47

The Effect of the Respondent's Sex

Computing the absolute difference between the effect of respondent's sex on gender identifier index (GII) mean scores for each painting (Table 8) shows a higher variance in three paintings (#9, #10 and #12). Two of these paintings (#9 and #12), were both scored more "feminine" by the male respondents, yet both painting's subject matter could be construed as having male themes. "Dear Friends" (#9), depicts six males in an old west setting. The second is a landscape entitled "Man Among the Redwoods" (#12).

The third painting with a high variance under this condition, "Wind and Crepe Myrtle Concerto" (#10) is one of two abstract paintings included in this study. Women scored this painting much higher (more feminine) than the

male respondents. It was also rated as poor art (68.2%) the most often (Table 7).

PGA-Male Effect

There is a substantial absolute difference between male and female respondent's gender identifier index (GII) score means for four paintings (#4, #6, #11 and #12) when they were attributed to male artists. These four were also rated more "feminine" by male respondents (Table 9). Two of the paintings, "Cha Cha: Brooklyn Terminal Market" (#6) and "Chanel" (#11) are the only photo-realism paintings included in the sample. The other two paintings with a high variance within this category also exclusively represent a specific painting style. "Gloucester Night Still Life" (#4) can broadly be defined as a primitive painting. Whereas "Man Among the Redwoods" (#12) is very distinctly a primitive piece. Thus, painting style could constitute one possible explanation for the variance.

Table 9. PGA Effects on GII Mean Scores

	PGA-Male Absolute Difference	PGA-Female Absolute Difference
#1	.48	.19
#2	.35	.52
#3	.28	.07
#4	1.36	.60
#5	.14	.16
Paintings #6	.58	.04
#7	.31	.43
#8	.15	.53
#9	.18	1.45
#10	.43	.29
#11	.59	.21
#12	1.20	1.76

PGA-Female Effect

The absolute difference between gender identifier index (GII) score means shows a higher degree of variance for three paintings (#4, #9 and #12). These paintings were also rated higher (more feminine) by the male respondents (Table 9). The primitive works (#4 and #12) have been compared and discussed above. Yet the addition of "Dear Friends" (#9) does not appear to suggest any specific patterning. There is not any substantial content or stylistic

similarity between these three paintings. However paintings #9 and #12 (discussed above) have similar male themes.

Table 10. The Combined Effect of the Respondents Sex and PGA on GII Mean Scores

	Males		Females		Absolute Difference
	PGA-M	PGA-F	PGA-M	PGA-F	
#1	15.52	15.54	16.00-H	15.35-L	.65
P #2	14.93-H	14.33-L	14.58	14.75	.60
A #3	14.60	15.04-H	14.32-L	14.97	.72
I #4	16.00-H	15.21	14.64	14.61-L	1.39
N #5	13.86-L	14.76-H	14.00	14.60	.90
T #6	10.67-H	10.20	10.09-L	10.24	.58
I #7	10.33-L	10.90-H	10.64	10.47	.67
N #8	10.79	10.95	10.64-L	11.48-H	.84
G #9	15.00	16.03-H	14.82	14.58-L	1.45
S #10	14.63-L	15.10	15.06	15.39-H	.76
#11	13.29-H	12.76	12.70-L	12.97	.59
#12	14.38-H	13.57	13.18	11.81-L	2.57

H = High score for painting
L = Low score for painting

The Combined PGA and Respondents Sex Effects

When combining both research effects of sex and PGA, the same three paintings (#4, #9 and #12) had GII mean scores with the greatest absolute difference (Table 10). Men rated the two primitives (#4 and #12), more feminine when they were attributed to male artists (PGA-male). Male respondents also rated "Dear Friends" (#9) the painting of the old west, higher in feminine identifiers when it was said to have been painted by a woman (PGA-female). The women rated these same paintings lowest (more "masculine") when attributed (PGA-female) to a woman artist.

CONCLUSIONS

The orientation of this study has been the significance of gender and its potential as a stigmatic social label in the field of art. As art objectifies both a society's ideals and biases, the recognition and appreciation of art can be seen as a pivotal point from which to study social values.

This project did not find support for the first research proposition asserting that the gender identifier index (GII) mean scores will vary for each painting by the perceived gender of its artist. They did not. The three remaining propositions were generally supported. The data does, however, reveal some interesting painting specific patterns. Evidently, in this study the respondent's perception of the painting's style, its subject matter, or the gender specific title appeared to account for more differences in judgments than the perceived gender of its painter. Three paintings (#4, #9 and #12) were found to have the greatest variance in Gender Identifier Index mean scores under several conditions. These patterns should be taken as tentative and no definite conclusions are to be drawn at this point.

Further research into the effect of a painting's subject matter, its title, and/or its painting style is needed. This study utilized a random sampling method to identify the twelve paintings. At that time no attention was given to these possible independent variables. A quota sampling of paintings, which selects a specific number of paintings exhibiting the characteristic style or content features, may illuminate other, perhaps non-gender, biases in recognition evaluation.

In general art is an area where subjective evaluative factors enter and its potential for further research into personal values is considerable. Investigations of this sort may act as a gauge of sexism within a given society, region, age group or gender, and even in cross-cultural comparisons. This project has served to bring an awareness of certain patterns of judgment that could be further expanded upon in an effort to understand all types of prejudice. Bourdieu's (1984) study of the influence of class backgrounds on aesthetic tastes and DiMaggio and Ostrower (1990) investigation of the effects of race on art participation serve as landmark works in this area. As Howard Becker (1982, p. 371) has conceptualized studies of artworks and artworlds as mirrors of our larger society, the sociology of art offers a rich and largely untapped site for future research.

APPENDIX

List of Paintings Shown

1.	May Stevens	"Soho Women Artists"	1978
2.	Alice Neel	"Carmen and Baby"	1972
3.	Janet Fish	"Wine and Cheese Glasses"	1975
4.	Nell Blaine	"Gloucester Night Still Life"	1975
5.	Jane Freilicher	"In Broad Daylight"	1979
6.	Idelle Weber	"Cha-Cha: Brooklyn Terminal Market"	1979
7.	Lee Krasner	"Abstract No. 2"	1946/48
8.	Dorothea Tanning	"Guardian Angels"	1946
9.	Joyce Treiman	"Dear Friends"	1972

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------|----------------------------------|------|
| 10. | Alma Thomas | "Wind and Crepe Myrtle Concerto" | 1973 |
| 11. | Audrey Flack | "Chanel" | 1974 |
| 12. | Marguerite Zorah | "Man Among the Redwoods" | 1912 |

REFERENCES

- Barron, F. 1972. *Artists in the Making*. New York, NY: Seminar Press.
- Becker, H. S. 1982. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bernard, J. S. 1964. *Academic Women*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Birg, L. and Y. Peterson. 1985. "Creativity as Sentiment: A Definition by Artists and Writers." *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology* 13(1):39-42.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MS: Harvard University Press.
- Boyette, N. and J. Reeves. 1982. "What does children's art work tell us about society?" Presented to Mid-South Sociological Association, Jackson, Mississippi: Oct. 27-30.
- _____. 1983. "What Does Children's Art Work Tell Us About Gender?" *Qualitative Sociology* 6(4):322-333.
- Castro, J. G. 1985. *The Art and Life of Georgia O'Keeffe*. New York, NY: Crown Publishers, Inc.
- Cole, J. and S. Cole. 1973. *Social Stratification in Science*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P. and F. Ostrower. 1990. "Participation in the Arts by Black and White Americans," *Social Forces* 68(3):753-778.
- Epstein, C. 1970. *Woman's Place*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Faulkender, P. J. 1985. "Relationship between BEM Sex-Role Inventory Groups and Attitudes of Sexism." *Psychological Reports* 57:227-235.
- Gillespie, D. 1979. "Overcoming Barriers." *Southern Quarterly* 17(2):80-86.
- Griff, M. 1970. "The Recruitment and Socialization of Artists." *Sociology of Art and Literature*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Hagan, J. 1990. "The Gender Stratification of Income Inequality Among Lawyers." *Social Forces* 68(3):835-855.
- Harris, C., M. Smith and P. Perricone. 1988. "The Artist and Androgyny, A Study of Gender Identity in Visual Artists." *Empirical Studies of the Arts* 6(1):67-78.
- Hess, T. B. 1971. "Editorial." *Art News* 69(9):49.
- Hughes, E. C. 1945. "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status." *American Journal of Sociology* 50:353-359.
- Lopate, C. 1968. *Women in Medicine*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press.
- Mattfield, J. and C. Van Aken, editors. 1965. *Women and the Scientific Professions*. Cambridge, MS: MIT Press.
- McCall, M. 1978. "The Sociology of Female Artists." *Studies in Symbolic Interaction* 1:289-318.
- McCane-O'Connor, M. 1979. "The Squaw as Artist." *Southern Quarterly* 17(2):8-15.
- Nemser, C. 1979. "Art Criticism and the Gender Prejudice." *Arts Magazine* 4(5):44-46.
- Nochlin, L. 1971. "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" *Art News* 69(9):22-39, 67-71.
- Polson, M. R. 1979. "The Feminine Sensibility and Inner Space." *The Southern Quarterly* 17(2):42-51.
- Rossi, S. R. and J. S. Rossi. 1985. "Gender Differences in the Perception of Women in Magazine Advertising." *Sex Roles* 12(9/10): 1033-1039.
- Rush, J. C. 1987. "Male and Female: Patterns of Professional Behavior in the University." *Art Education* 40(3):22-24, 33-35.
- Simon, R., S. Clark, and K. Galway. 1967. "The Woman PhD.: A Recent Profile." *Social Problems* 15:221-236.
- Singer, M. S. and A. E. Singer. 1984. "Sex Differences in the Perception of Male and Female Police Officers in New Zealand." *Journal of Psychology* 119(1):53-57.
- Streifer-Rubinstein, C. 1982. *American Women Artists*. Boston, MS: Avon Books.
- Touhey, J. C. 1974. "Effects of Additional Women Professionals on Ratings of Occupational Prestige and Desirability." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 29(1):86-89.
- Weisstein, N. 1970. "Psychology Constructs the Female." In *Sisterhood is Powerful*, edited by R. Morgan. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- White, J. 1971. "Women in the Law." *The Professional Woman* Cambridge, MS:647-659.
- Whitesel, L. 1975. "Women as Art Students, Teachers and Artists." *Art Education* 28(3):22-26.
- Zimmerman, E. 1981. "Women Also Created Art." *Art Education* 34(3):5.